



## University of Baltimore Law Review

Volume 30  
Issue 2 Spring 2001

Article 1

2001

# University of Baltimore Law Review Volume 30 Number 2 (Spring 2001) Front Matter

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ublr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

(2001) "University of Baltimore Law Review Volume 30 Number 2 (Spring 2001) Front Matter," *University of Baltimore Law Review*: Vol. 30: Iss. 2, Article 1.

Available at: <http://scholarworks.law.ubalt.edu/ublr/vol30/iss2/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@University of Baltimore School of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Baltimore Law Review by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@University of Baltimore School of Law. For more information, please contact [snolan@ubalt.edu](mailto:snolan@ubalt.edu).

**UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE  
LAW REVIEW**

**VOLUME 30**

**2000-2001**

# UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

## LAW REVIEW

---

VOLUME THIRTY

SPRING 2001

NUMBER TWO

---

### EDITORIAL BOARD

*Editor in Chief*  
Michaela F. Roberts

*Managing Editor*  
Kimberly A. Butlak

*Business Editor*  
Jefferson L. Triplett

*Production Editors*  
Richard Kutchev

*Marketing Editor*  
Amy E. Askew

*Executive Editor*  
Heather E. Boardman

*Manuscript Editor*  
M. Susan Mason

*Comments Editor*  
Kai-Niklas A. Schneider

### ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Erika S. Alsid  
Georganne Carter  
Thomas Coleman  
Nicole Harrell Duke

Melody Lynn Ellison  
Craig Leavers  
Donna B. Novak McElroy  
Michael P. O'Day

### STAFF

David Armitage  
G. James Benoit  
Robert Carlozzi  
Dale Cathell  
Margie S. Chapin  
Kevin C. Clark  
Joseph Cleary  
Glenn A. Cline  
Victoria J. Cyr  
Miatta Dabo  
Erin Devaney  
Jennifer P. Ferragut

Piedad Gomez  
Joshua C. Green  
Melodie Hahn  
Jesse B. Hammock  
Geoffrey G. Hengerer  
Jennifer C. Jordan  
Phil Karasic  
Lawrence Keen, III  
David B. Kramer  
Andrew J. Lobley  
Lisa J. Lowe

Patricia McQueeney  
Lisa Oliveri  
Kimberly T. Owens  
Tracey Parker  
Rebecca Schneider  
James K. Smith  
Stefanie Stein  
Andrew Stern  
John A. Straus  
Audra L. Trouland  
Jaime Walker  
Catherine Worthington

---

*Faculty Advisor*  
Professor John A. Lynch

*Faculty Advisor Emeritus*  
Professor Emeritus Eugene J. Davidson

*Administrative Assistant*  
Karen Y. Taylor

# UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

## LAW REVIEW

---

---

VOLUME THIRTY

SPRING 2001

NUMBER TWO

---

---

### Introduction

*The Honorable Alan M. Wilner* ix

### ARTICLES

Plaintiffs' Fault in Products Liability Cases: Why are they Getting  
Away With it in Maryland?

*Gardner M. Duvall* 255

A Comparison of The *Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability*  
and the Maryland Law of Products Liability

*Robert D. Klein* 273

Restating the Obvious in Maryland Products Liability Law: The  
*Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability* and Failure to Warn  
Defenses

*Rebecca Korzec* 341

Direct-to-Consumer Advertising and the Learned Intermediary  
Doctrine: Unsettling a Settled Question

*Paul F. Strain* 377

*Christina L. Gaarder*

### COMMENT

Surgically Implanted Medical Device Liability: Will the New  
*Restatement* Help the Unraveling Shield Created by *Medtronic, Inc.*  
*v. Lohr*?

*Donna M. Senft* 389

## INTRODUCTION



**The Honorable Alan M. Wilner<sup>†</sup>**

Eighty-five years ago, Benjamin Cardozo, for the New York Court of Appeals, moved products liability law into the first half of the Twentieth Century by recognizing that “if the nature of a thing is such that it is reasonably certain to place life and limb in peril when negligently made, it is then a thing of danger,” that “[i]ts nature gives warning to the consequences to be expected”, and that “[i]f to the element of danger there is added knowledge that the thing will be used by persons other than the purchaser, and used without new tests, then, irrespective of contract, the manufacturer of this thing of danger is under a duty to make it carefully.”<sup>1</sup> The case, of course, was *MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.*,<sup>2</sup> in which the court concluded that, when a manufacturer fails in that duty, it may be held liable to remote purchasers and users of its product and not to just its immediate customers in the marketing chain.

Though perhaps visionary in its time, *MacPherson* was nonetheless limiting, in that actions for injuries resulting from dangerous and defective products remained constrained by the prevailing concepts of

---

<sup>†</sup> Judge Alan M. Wilner is a judge on the Court of Appeals of Maryland. He received his A.B. in 1958 from The Johns Hopkins University and received his J.D. in 1962 from University of Maryland School of Law. Judge Wilner also received a M.L.A. in 1966 from The Johns Hopkins University.

1. *MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co.*, 217 N.Y. 382, 389, 111 N.E. 1050, 1053 (1916).

2. 217 N.Y. 382, 111 N.E. 1050 (1916).

negligence law—duty, foreseeability, breach, contributory negligence, assumption of risk. Nearly a half century later, in 1964, the American Law Institute paved the way for breaking free of those constraints when, as part of the *Restatement (Second) of Torts*, it adopted section 402A, which has been characterized, perhaps loosely, as establishing “strict liability.” Whether anticipated by Professors Prosser and Wade, who, sequentially, acted as reporters for the project, section 402A has served as the engine that has moved products liability law both literally and figuratively into the space age. Virtually every kind of industrial and consumer product released into the stream of commerce—from all types of machinery, devices, substances, appliances, and vehicles to even human blood—has been held to be within its reach.

Even before Maryland decided to adopt the concept of “strict liability” as enunciated in section 402A, the *University of Baltimore Law Review* recognized the growing importance of this area of law and devoted its Fall, 1975 edition to a symposium on the subject. My friend and colleague, John C. Eldridge, now the senior judge on the Court of Appeals of Maryland, wrote the Introduction to that issue and noted that it provided an in-depth analysis of several of the complex areas.

Much, of course, has occurred since that last analysis twenty-five years ago. Maryland has adopted section 402A, and the addition of the “strict liability” concepts enunciated in that section to the arsenal of negligence and warranty law, coupled with the always-amazing ingenuity of lawyers, the technological revolution that has occurred, and the increased sophistication and complexity of our market economy, has produced a need for another objective evaluation of this area of law. The focal point for that evaluation is the American Law Institute’s development of the *Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability*, published in 1998. In the introduction to that work, the Institute noted that the thousands of judicial decisions rendered since the publication of *Restatement (Second)* had “fine-tuned the law of products liability in a manner hardly imaginable when *Restatement (Second)* was written” and that issues that had not occurred to the persons who drafted *Restatement (Second)* had “become points of serious contention and debate in the courts.”<sup>3</sup> On “almost every page” of *Restatement (Third)*, the Institute said, it had responded to questions “that were not part of the landscape 35 years ago.”<sup>4</sup>

As might be expected, the rules set forth in *Restatement (Third)* have attracted the attention of the Bar and the Bench, as well as the business and consumer protection communities. Much critical comment—some favorable, some unfavorable, some mixed—has been

---

3. RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF TORTS: PRODUCTS LIABILITY at *Introduction*, p. 3 (1998).

4. *Id.*

received, and it is now in the hands of the nation's courts and legislatures whether to adopt, in whole or in part, the principles set forth in that work. The decision of the *University of Baltimore Law Review* to devote this issue to another symposium on the subject is to be applauded. The articles, which, as Judge Eldridge noted in his Introduction to the last symposium, can address only some of the swirling issues, will nonetheless help to focus the debate. The major articles are written by competent and experienced lawyers who have practiced or taught in this field, and they express views that are worthy of fair consideration.